COMMENT ON THE TYPE-SPECIES OF THE CONODONT GENUS *POLYGNATHUS*. (Z.N.(S.) 1796)

(see volume 24, pages 239–243)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Klapper and his colleagues raise two sound objections (par. 10) to the alternative of designating a neotype for *Polygnathus dubius* Hinde, the type-species of the conodont genus *Polygnathus*. Clearly the same objections, and particularly their first, apply forcefully in principle to any other action.

The lectotype of *P. dubius* is still in existence, and it is entire (as conodonts go!) but partly embedded in a matrix so that only one aspect can be seen. In many groups, the actual existence of an entire (lecto) holotype would be welcomed. The obvious step is to treat it in such manner that the other aspects can be studied, and the zoological assignment determined. Then and then only should the need of coming to the Commission be determined.

I am opposed to dealing with the application until the zoology has been properly explored.

REPLY TO COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *CORNUFER UNICOLOR* TSCHUDI, 1838 (AMPHIBIA). Z.N.(S.) 1749

(see volume 23, pages 167–168, volume 24, page 192)

By Richard G. Zweifel (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.*)

I have shown that the type-species of the genus *Cornufer*, a name commonly applied to ranid frogs of the Pacific islands, is a species of leptodactylid frog of the West Indies (Zweifel, *Copeia* **1967** : 117–121). In order to preserve the well-established name *Eleutherodactylus*, which is a junior synonym of *Cornufer*, I requested that *Cornufer* be suppressed by the plenary powers. Darlington *et al.* (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** : 192) agree that *Eleutherodactylus* should be conserved, but wish to conserve *Cornufer* also because it "is celebrated in the biogeographical literature". They propose that the Commission do this by suppressing all previous type designations for the genus *Cornufer* and designate a species commonly referred to *Cornufer* in the past (*vitiensis* Girard) as the type of the genus.

The transfer of a generic name from the species and family with which it originally was associated to another species and family is a major exception to the rules of nomenclature, and I am not convinced that Darlington *et al.* put forth a strong enough case to justify this action in the face of the alternative use of the name *Platymantis*. Retention of *Cornufer* would be defensible if the genus were of great importance in the literature or if there was the likelihood of serious confusion among workers using the specialized segment of the literature in which *Cornufer* assumes some importance; there is no evidence that either of these conditions obtains.

Darlington *et al.* correctly observe that every writer who has dealt with the biogeography of the Fijian frogs has used the name *Cornufer*, but it is not evident from their brief discussion that all of the writers they cite as examples used both *Cornufer* and *Platymantis* as valid genera for Fijian frogs. Therefore, any worker using these references need not be confused by the extention of *Platymantis* to include both Fijian species, any more than by the use of *Cornufer* for both. The question is whether a name's being "celebrated in the biogeographical literature" warrants suspension of the rules of nomenclature. Indeed, one could argue that the name *Platymantis*, which shares prominence with *Cornufer* in the papers cited, is equally "celebrated".